

MINUTES OF CASE COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD TUESDAY, OCT. 8, 1963

Present: Mr. Schein - Chairman
Mr. Osborne III
Mr. Schaefer
Miss Voigt
Mrs. Rosenberg
Mrs. Casey
Mr. Kilduff

Mr. Schein had suggested to the committee that they read the report carefully prior to this meeting. Mr. Schein in reading the report identified the criticisms one by one and felt we should run them down this way in the committee and out of our discussions would come a report to be given to the Board at large. He had one suggestion which was that the staff members on the committee attend the Board meeting, as some of the questions are technical and the Board would require the staff to give lay explanations.

The first criticism Mr. Schein commented on at today's meeting was the third paragraph, page 2, item "A", and had to do with expert counseling given to motivated clients. It was felt that the crux of the criticism was that we were serving a limited motivated clientele. Are we serving the community best in this way? What are the alternatives? This evolves to a matter of philosophy and a matter of re-evaluating our program. Where should our major emphasis be? This is the kind of concept we have to look at.

Miss Voigt referred to the project the agency had done in the Hayes Homes and felt this could be reviewed. She commented there is a great need for the help we can give, if we can get to the people and they can accept it. In order to reach these masses of people, can we do a better job of reaching out? How can one do this? What is the general approach, the sociological approach?

Mrs. Rosenberg discussed this in relation to the Newark Housing Authority and specifically mentioned the Tenant Relations organization. Though the Housing Authority is totally inadequate in staff, they have gotten families to the point of seeing a family counselor, but these people were not ready to go out of their homes. Mr. Kilduff mentioned the experience F.S.B. had in working with the Newark Housing Authority and the fact we had tried to establish a liaison arrangement which would enable us to discuss cases with their personnel to determine what areas we could work in cooperatively with them. Following this discussion with Mr. Irving Laskowitz we were advised by him that the only cases they had were 40 house-keeping cases which he felt required service at that time. Mrs. Rosenberg wondered if renewed efforts with the Housing Authority might not be tried with the South Side project in mind. She also commented that it does not necessarily require the highest trained person, that maybe we could use a less trained person, such as case aide.

Mr. Schaefer felt that getting into this thing would be rather costly and the slowness with which these people respond - a current luxury we could not afford. He felt that finances being as difficult as they were at present, we had to take this into consideration first and consider programs with this in mind.

Mrs. Rosenberg wondered whether the question wasn't whether or not we were best serving the community within our present budget and that it may be a matter of re-arranging our schedule. It was also pointed out that this was the Casework Committee's responsibility, whereas the finances would be the responsibility of the Finance Committee. Mr. Osborne felt we had a mandate from the Board of Trustees to examine this report and it needed to be examined within the framework of the Case Committee.

Miss Voigt commented on the changed social structure of Newark and that this is a challenge. The upper classes are leaving the city to people who have not had the same advantages and as a result the city is going through a tremendous evolution. There was considerable discussion about the sociological factors involved. However, it was agreed that regardless of finances, it was necessary to set up a plan and then tailor it to suit our part. Mr. Schein pointed out before we even make a plan, we have to make a decision as to the direction we want to go and he felt the professional staff was best qualified as to how this should be done. The question to determine is should we do anything different than we are now doing? If we do decide to do something different, the question of when and how would follow. This brought up considerable discussion of the South Side project and the way in which the agency and the project might work cooperatively.

In summary, Mrs. Rosenberg brought out we may have to remain as we are but we have to look further and make a new kind of attempt to reach the community in its changed circumstances. She did not think the South Side project had funds available, but perhaps when available it might enable us to hire a person for six months to get a record of cases and what happened in families where problems needed to be attacked. Mr. Osborne felt such a hypothetic worker would be a salesman for the agency and this would have a very good psychological effect with the Welfare Federation. The question as to what schools and agencies could give us referrals in the Clinton Hill area, which is the area covered by the South Side project and how the agency and project could arrange for a detached worker was discussed. Mr. Schein felt perhaps one worker could be diverted in this way but pointed out anything beyond what we are doing be done within the present budget and with a re-alignment, realizing that this could very easily create a waiting list for the agency.

The committee authorized Mr. Kilduff to call Mr. Meyers to ask if it would be at all feasible if we did have a plan to get funds from the project. If he said no, then the only alternative was to put it in our budget. If he said yes, we could invite him to our next meeting.

Next meeting will be held Tuesday, November 12th, at 11 a.m.